



SAVANNAH HISTORIC DISTRICT
BOARD OF REVIEW

Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room
October 13, 2010 2:00 p.m.
Meeting Minutes

OCTOBER 13, 2010 HISTORIC DISTRICT BOARD OF REVIEW REGULAR MEETING

HDRB Members Present: Brian Judson, Chair
Sidney Johnson, Vice Chair
Reed Engle
Linda Ramsay
Ned Gay
Dr. Nicholas Henry
Ebony Simpson

HDRB Members Not Present: W. James Overton
Gene Hutchinson
Richard Law
Robin Williams, Ph.D

MPC Staff Present: Tom Thomson, Executive Director
Sarah Ward, Historic Preservation Director
Julie Yawn, Systems Analyst
Mary E. Mitchell, Administrative Assistant
Brittany Bryant, Intern

City of Savannah Staff Present: Mike Rose, City Building Inspector
Tiras Petrea, City Zoning Inspector

I. CALL TO ORDER AND WELCOME

1. [Order](#)

Mr. Judson called the meeting to order at 2:10 p.m., welcomed everyone and introduced **Ms. Brittany Bryant**, Preservation Intern. Ms. Bryant is pursuing a Masters Degree in Fine Arts in Architecture History From SCAD.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

2. [Approval of September 8, 2010 Meetings Minutes](#)

Attachment: [09-08-2010 Minutes.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approve September 8, 2010 Meeting Minutes. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Ned Gay

Second: Sidney J. Johnson

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Gene Hutchinson - Not Present

Sidney J. Johnson - Aye

Brian Judson - Abstain

W James Overton - Not Present

Linda Ramsay - Aye

Ebony Simpson - Aye

III. ITEM(S) REQUESTED TO BE REMOVED FROM THE FINAL AGENDA

IV. SIGN POSTING

V. CONTINUED AGENDA

VI. CONSENT AGENDA

3. [Amended Petition of Gretchen Callejas for Greenline Architecture - H-10-4271-2 - 611 Whitaker Street - Dormer Addition and Fence](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approve the amended petition for the addition of the dormer on the north elevation, and the bi-fold gate and iron fence with masonry base at the rear of the property as submitted. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: Ned Gay

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Gene Hutchinson	- Not Present
Sidney J. Johnson	- Aye
Brian Judson	- Abstain
W James Overton	- Not Present
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye

4. [Continued Petition of Doug Bean for J. Parker Ltd. - H-10-4304-2 - 19 W. Broughton Street - Principal Use Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approval for the principle use projecting sign as submitted. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Reed Engle
Second: Ned Gay

Reed Engle	- Aye
Ned Gay	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Gene Hutchinson	- Not Present
Sidney J. Johnson	- Aye
Brian Judson	- Abstain
W James Overton	- Not Present
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye

5. [Petition of Maggie Granquist - H-10-4314-2 - 32 Barnard Street - Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approval for the installation of the exterior sign as submitted. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Reed Engle
Second: Ned Gay

Reed Engle	- Aye
Ned Gay	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Gene Hutchinson	- Not Present

Sidney J. Johnson	- Aye
Brian Judson	- Abstain
W James Overton	- Not Present
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye

6. [Petition of Morris Multimedia, Inc. - H-10-4320-2 - 27 Abercorn Street - Fence](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approval for the metal fence with the masonry base and sliding gate as submitted. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: Ned Gay

Reed Engle	- Aye
Ned Gay	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Gene Hutchinson	- Not Present
Sidney J. Johnson	- Aye
Brian Judson	- Abstain
W James Overton	- Not Present
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye

7. [Petition of Andrew Lynch for Lynch Associates Architects - H-10-4321-2 - 220 West Broughton Street - Rehabilitation and Alterations](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Approval for the rehabilitation and alterations with the following conditions: 1. The new entrance door frame is flush with the storefront, matching the façade profile; 2. Mortar matches existing in strength, composition, color, texture, width and profile. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: Ned Gay

Reed Engle	- Aye
Ned Gay	- Aye

Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Gene Hutchinson	- Not Present
Sidney J. Johnson	- Aye
Brian Judson	- Aye
W James Overton	- Not Present
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye

VII. REGULAR AGENDA

8. [Amended Petition of Pat Shay - H-10-4222-2 - 701 Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard - New Construction and Fence](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Mr. Pat Shay was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Ward gave the staff report. The Petition is requesting approval to amend the application for new construction of a mixed-use commercial building at 701 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd. to include a freestanding kiosk for the Carver State Bank within the surface parking lot and for a brick fence surrounding the St. Philip A.M.E. Church building.

Ms. Ward reported that the staff recommends approval of the kiosk and the fence, including the relocation of the sign, with the condition that the brick for the fence match the brick on the historic church building to which it is attached. A masonry base must be incorporated and should match the brick on the church building. Approval does not include any signage for the bank, grocery or kiosk.

Mr. Engle said in looking at sheet 5, this is probably not the Board's purview, is the kiosk 12 feet from the sidewalk?

Ms. Ward answered yes.

Mr. Engle said in looking at the site plan, it's about 42 feet from the sidewalk. He did not understand the traffic plan that is shown on the site plan.

Ms. Ward responded that this is a separate issue. The City of Savannah reviews this as a part of the site plan. The Traffic Engineering department is looking into this aspect. They must have a certain amount of queuing space for the tellers as well as appropriate drive aisles. She believes, too, that this is beyond the purview of this Board and she could not give an answer as it is beyond her expertise.

Mr. Engle stated that the site plan could change.

Ms. Ward said it is possible that the site plan could change, but it would be limited to striping. This Board is not approving the site plan, but the design of the kiosk in its current location.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Shay said essentially they agree with the staff's comments. But, in addition, he had a sideline conversation with Mr. Daniel Carey of Historic Savannah Foundation. Mr. Carey made a suggestion to him that they would like to explore further which is rather than have the fence run into the side of the existing church and stop, that they have a pier set away from the church so that the fence would end at a pier rather than at the side of the church. He believes this was a good suggestion. They are showing that they have added the low brick wall. Mr. Shay believes that the standards are requesting that there be a low bit of masonry and not the fence all the way down to the ground. As he understood the standard, this is a requirement of every place that faces a public street, but not necessarily a requirement for everywhere else. Therefore, because they are trying to meet the standard, but not do more than they need to, Area A and B are the areas of the brick fence that face the public right-of-way. He guesses that one could make the case that this section does this since the public right-of-way is here although their drawing does not show all the landscaping that is around the parking lot. They are asking the Board's permission to do a design that he just showed them that is consistent with the staff's recommendation. The areas are A, B and C and then they will comeback with an alternative design for the fence that is along the side that faces the fast food restaurant that is immediately adjacent to it. He is running out of budget for brick. The piers would be approximately 24 feet a part. This is actually the existing sign relocated on this side, but in general what they are recommending is that other than this one location that the piers be approximately 16 feet a part.

As far as the brick color, they are willing to work with staff to identify a brick that matches either, but they are not sure which of the two colors of brick that is on the side of the existing St. Phillips Church. However, this is only a matter of literally getting samples out there and may be meet with the Board to go over the samples. The face brick that is on the facade that faces Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard somewhat wraps around for one bay on the facade and then there is a softer redder brick that goes from there back. The existing sign appears to him to be closer to the softer redder brick. He is aware that they don't want it to be so close that it appears that they are trying to make something that looks like it is 100 years old. Nevertheless, what he is asking is that he be allowed to come back to staff and show specific brick samples of what they are proposing.

Mr. Shay reported that regarding the traffic flow, all of that has been approved. As a matter of fact, the kiosk, the location and the fence have all been approved by the Historic Review Board, but at the time they did not have the design detail, but they are presenting this to the Board today. With regards to the walk-up ATM, it is actually going to be on the front of the bank building near the front door as you walk into the bank. The ATM that is in the kiosk will actually be setup so that someone who is driving could do their transactions here.

Mr. Judson asked Mr. Shay to display his diagram on the monitor that shows the labeling of Areas A, B, and C. He stated that stipulation be given to the north elevation, the long fence bordering the fast food restaurant be referred to as D, and the short span at the area be referred to as E in order to clarify further discussion about these sections of the fence.

Mr. Engle asked Mr. Shay if they have gone from having brick piers eight feet on center to brick piers 24 feet a part?

Mr. Shay answered typically 16 feet on center.

Mr. Engle said this is staggering along the iron fence.

Mr. Judson asked Mr. Shay to clarify whether he is saying this spacing is on side D or the entire side.

Mr. Shay replied that if the Board is unhappy with the 24 feet span, they will be willing to add one in the middle. Sixteen (16) feet is the maximum distance on side C. The distance is up for some discussion for sides A and B. At this point, they are not asking the Board to approve this, but they would like to come back with an alternative proposal for side D and E since they don't face the public right-of-way. They may not have any brick in them at all. The idea with the existing sign is actually to pick it up and set it on the corner in the same orientation as it is presently. Now of course, only one side of it would be visible because the other side would partially be screened. This is one of the reasons they want to have a more transparent fence. However, he believes this is a good compromise. As you walk along here, you will be able to see the inside of the sign as well as the outside when you walk from the other direction.

Mr. Johnson asked if the parking lot with the church and the parking lot for the bank have any conflicts. He knows that the church has events during the day. But, he realizes that this is not this Board's purview. But, he was just interested in this aspect.

Mr. Shay answered that the church and the grocery store developer are in essence partners on the parking space. They have an agreement between them as to how they will manage the parking as a jointly shared resource.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Engle said he had a problem with 24 feet on the front elevation. He believes the piers should not be more than 12 feet apart. The 24 feet would be a large span; even though it is not the purview of this Board, but if someone runs into the wall, 24 feet of iron fence would have to be taken out instead of 12 feet. He aesthetically liked the eight feet, but he can see the problem regarding the cost of the brick. Nevertheless, he still believes it should be 12 feet on center on the front.

Mr. Shay said they are willing to agree to the 12 feet facing Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard.

Mr. Judson said he is aware that they have this in detail, but he wanted to know what are the links of the span of A and B.

Mr. Shay answered that it is about 24 feet. Therefore, it will end up with a pier in the middle and a pier next to the church. It is about 40 feet and they will divide this into three

sections. It will not be 12 feet, but they will be closer together than 16 feet.

Mr. Engle asked if the south pier in Area A is in fact the end of the sign.

Mr. Shay replied that the south pier which is A is actually the existing sign relocated.

Ms. Ramsay asked that putting the pier there, would it harm the visibility of the sign?

Mr. Shay said they were concerned about someone walking along the sidewalk and looking through the fence and seeing the back side of the sign. But he believes they will be alright.

Board Action:

Approve the kiosk and the fence, including the relocation of the sign, with the following conditions:

1. Where the fence fronts onto Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd, pier spacing must not exceed 12 feet on center south of the church, and must be divided into three equal sections north of the church;

- PASS

2. Submit brick sample to match church building to staff for final approval; and

3. Incorporate a brick base where fronting a public street.

Approval does not include any signage for the bank, grocery or kiosk.

Vote Results

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: Ned Gay

Reed Engle

- Aye

Ned Gay

- Aye

Nicholas Henry

- Aye

Gene Hutchinson

- Not Present

Sidney J. Johnson

- Aye

Brian Judson

- Abstain

W James Overton

- Not Present

Linda Ramsay

- Aye

Ebony Simpson

- Aye

9. [Amended Petition of Pete Callejas for Greenline Architecture - H-10-4279-2 - 10 East Taylor](#)

Street - Fence

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Board Action:

Continue to November 10, 2010 - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: Nicholas Henry

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Gene Hutchinson - Not Present

Sidney J. Johnson - Aye

Brian Judson - Abstain

W James Overton - Not Present

Linda Ramsay - Aye

Ebony Simpson - Aye

10. Continued Petition of Nathan Pollard for Kern-Coleman - H-10-4302-2 - 660 E. Broughton Street - Rehabilitation/Alteration

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Mr. Nathan Pollard was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Sarah Ward gave the staff report. This is a continuation from the September 8, 2010 meeting. The petitioner is requesting approval for exterior alterations to the Kehoe Machine Shop building at 660 East Broughton Street in order to stabilize the building which is currently in a state of disrepair due to rust and degradation of the materials. This building is not specifically listed as a historic structure while the main building is listed as a historic structure within the Savannah National Historic Landmark District. It is eligible for designation due to its association with the Kehoe facility.

Ms. Ward stated that some of the things that the staff was asked to look at as this hearing was continued from the last meeting were the applicability of the Secretary of Interior Standards because the building is not currently listed as a historical building. At the last meeting, the staff did suggested that they apply. The staff consulted with the City Attorney's office and they found that the Secretary of Interior Standards for rehabilitation are not applicable because the building is not currently classified as historic. Staff is working to update the historic building map. This was something that they started doing when they begun the revisions to the ordinance in 2007. Therefore, the staff has a drafted map that identifies this building as historic. The staff hopes to start this public hearing

process by the end of 2010. However, the staff does not feel that it is appropriate to hold up this petition while they get the map updated.

At the last meeting a lot of questions were raised about whether the materials of the building were original or historic and what would have been included on the monitor. The staff found a 1916 Sanborn Fire Insurance map showing the structure. The building is not listed on the 1898 map. The building is shown as an iron frame building, clad in iron. In doing research of corrugated galvanized sheet iron, they found that it actually has been around since the early 1800s and most likely was originally used for this building. It was an industrial building and was ancillary to the main building. Therefore, staff suggests that they originally used corrugated iron metal on the building and as it deteriorated, they may have used a similar material. This is what the builder is proposing to use in their amended application, with the exception of the roof.

Ms. Ward reported that the petitioner has revised the scope of work to meet the recommendation of the previous staff report and in light of the City Attorney's comments, the staff recommends approval for stabilization of the Kehoe Machine Shop building, with the condition that the decorative metal cornice, on the south elevation, be retained and reinstalled. As indicated on the revised submittal, windows must be retained in situ or stored on-site until repairs are made and reinstalled. Documentation of their location to be undertaken with measured drawings must be resubmitted to staff prior to issuance of a building permit and windows be reinstalled after stabilization is complete.

Mr. Judson asked Ms. Ward if she said the cornice is on the north.

Ms. Ward corrected her statement by saying the cornice is on the south.

Mr. Engle stated that he is more concerned with the process in the ordinance as what he sees has not been followed in the ordinance based on the recommendation. He read two points from the ordinance and said his contention is that this building is pertinent to the historic structure. Therefore this is an outbuilding to Kehoe. Therefore, why are the Secretary Standards not relevant and why does the City Attorney say they are not applicable? His second point is that he would contend that once they take off all the exterior covering of the building, they would be essentially demolishing the integrity of that structure. This Board does not deal with interiors, they only deal with exterior elevations. This Board is saying that everything could be taken away and only replace a part of it. Some of it not in-kind and some of it not at all. To him this is exterior demolition of a structure. The Board's criteria in the ordinance states if Certificate of Appropriateness for demolition is to be issued, a determination of eligibility for that structure must be conducted first. An investigation should be done first to determine if the building is eligible for historic destination. He believes they are violating the ordinance.

Ms. Ward stated that both of the sections of the ordinance that Mr. Engle spoke of, in talking with the City Attorney they felt they did not need to be present today to address this issue; that the Board could work it out. She said, however, Mr. Engle is correct that an argument could be made for both standards in referring to it as an outbuilding. They also felt that an opposing argument could be made as to why the standard does not apply. Therefore, in this respect, they see that the ordinance needs to be tightened up so they won't have this ambiguity. One of the reasons she believes that it could be argued that it can apply is because the title of the section is called "Preservation of Historic Structure."

The way that they have learned to read an ordinance is from beginning to end and under this title, if it is not historic, she would not apply the standard. However, the City Attorney office did agree with the Board that because the outbuilding is an ancillary structure that is contemporaneous to the period of significance of the Kehoe Iron Works that this could be applied.

Ms. Ward said they did not consider this as demolition at the last hearing as the petitioner was trying to stabilize the building; she does not feel that it would be fair to provide an alternate standard at this time. The petitioner submitted this as a stabilization. She does see how when all the building material is removed, it could be a slippery slope where they could be going into demolition. However, since they did not propose this as the proposed action or identify it as such at the last hearing, she does not think that it is particularly fair to hold the petitioner to that standard at this hearing. But, she believes that in going back to the first item, the Preservation of Outbuildings an appurtenance to historic buildings, that the petitioner could be held to this. If the Secretary Standards do apply, she believes that they have actually almost held the petitioner to a lot of the standards as they will be replacing the corrugated sheet iron with, although not iron, a new contemporary material, but with the same finish and profile to match the existing, with documentation of the windows to be replaced and the roof material will be the only change in material. The Board is correct that they would not recommend when following the Secretary of Interior Standards that historic roof material be replaced with an alternate material as they want the petitioner to go back with the corrugated sheet metal to match the existing as they believe it was most likely original.

Mr. Johnson asked if the Board is complying with the ordinance.

Ms. Ward replied that she believes the staff's recommendation is in compliance with the ordinance. In consultation with the City Attorney's office, the sections that Mr. Engle has proposed, they indicated that this would also be an appropriate application of the ordinance as well.

Dr. Henry asked for clarity if the brick building is designated as a historic building. The metal building is an appurtenance to the brick building under the law. Therefore, does this say that it is a historic building?

Ms. Ward confirmed that the brick building is designated as a historic building and says that the metal building should also meet the Secretary of Interior Standards for preservation. But, this does not designate it.

Mr. Gay asked if the petitioner wants to use a standing seam roof and the staff is saying come back with the corrugated.

Ms. Ward stated that the staff is recommending approval of the roof as submitted.

Mr. Gay asked if the staff is recommending the standing seam.

Ms. Ward replied yes; she is okay with this. The petitioner has already come into compliance with all the other standards. Also, the building is not currently classified as a historic structure. Mr. Engle has suggested, rightfully so and the City Attorney's office

agrees, that the Secretary of Interior Standards apply to this building. But, the Board could actually apply the Preservation Standards in this case. There could be an opposing argument as this is not cut and dry, but if the Board desires that it be applicable, they can do so.

Mr. Thomson, MPC Executive Director, asked the staff to enumerate what the difference would be regarding the request/recommendation in these standards.

Ms. Ward stated that in her opinion, the difference would be whether or not they use the standing seam metal roof or the preservation standards would require that they go back with the corrugated sheet metal roof to match the existing.

Mr. Engle stated that this is not his biggest issue. His issue is putting back the walls.

Ms. Ward stated that she has already stipulated this. She believes that the Board should recommend this in their decision.

Mr. Engle stated that the Secretary's Standards have allowed standing seam in lieu of corrugated for years. It is not replacement in-kind, but it is metal going back for metal. It is better than asphalt replacing metal. However, what concerns him here in the biggest demolition violation is not putting the walls back. They have original material or very old material on the sidewalls and they only are not putting them back, but they are not keeping them either. To him this is unacceptable by the Secretary Standards. He believes it should be done at a termination, but if the petitioner was to say that they are going to demolish it, they are going to put all the sidewalls back in-kind, then it really is not demolition and, therefore, the Standards could wait until a determination next year. But, if not he believes the Board should say no.

Mr. Gay asked if the reason the petitioner does not want to put the sides back is because they don't know what they are going to do with the building.

Ms. Ward stated she believes the petitioner is just taking the sides out temporarily to stabilize the structure. They are not just documenting them for posterity, but doing so in order to know exactly where to put them when the walls are replaced. She believes that if the Secretary of Interior Standards are applied, they can require this as a part of their approval that the walls go back.

Dr. Henry stated that in reading the staff's recommendation, the windows are stated but not the materials.

Ms. Ward stated that the petitioner has indicated that the metal material is deteriorated beyond repair and cannot be salvaged in its entirety because the rivet points are rusted out. Therefore, they would have to cut into smaller sections. She does not have a problem with the petitioner replacing the corrugated sheet metal.

Dr. Henry asked if there is a way they can confirm that the metal material is truly deteriorated.

Ms. Ward stated that she believes that the petitioner has attested to this. She has been to the site and it is in bad shape. They have engineers who can verify this. Even if the

petitioner was able to salvage some portions, it would be a completely different size and it will not necessarily be able to be screwed into where the structural members are because those points are rusted out.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Pollard stated that he is in agreement with the staff at this point. He solicited questions from the Board.

Mr. Judson said that when Ms. Ward was talking about the documenting of the windows and storing them on site, they then moved into a question where Mr. Engle had a major concern, which is the remaining siding. He asked Mr. Pollard if his proposal at this point is as it was at the last hearing leaving it naked or are they talking about replenishing the siding.

Mr. Pollard answered that they will replace it down to a structural point. The seam just above the window is the bottom of the structure. This is where they are proposing to replace the siding down to. He said that not having a client or tenant for the future use, they are leaving it open.

Mr. Johnson asked if they would be using the same siding that they remove.

Mr. Pollard answered that it would be new siding to match the existing. As Ms. Ward said, it is in disrepair and he cannot replace holes in galvanized steel.

Ms. Simpson asked if they would not begin rehabilitation until they get a client.

Mr. Pollard answered yes.

Ms. Simpson asked Mr. Pollard if he knew potentially how long this would be.

Mr. Pollard answered no.

Mr. Gay stated at this point, the petitioner would have to come back to the Historic Review Board. He asked Ms. Ward if she was suggesting that where the siding is removed, that they agree to put it back.

Ms. Ward stated if the Board holds the petitioner to the preservation standard, she believes they should make this as a part of their decision.

Mr. Engle asked Mr. Pollard if they are going to put up chain link fencing around this building. He has visited here three times within the last two weeks. On every occasion there were always people here in the doorway and everywhere else. Once this is opened up to the public, it will become available for anyone who wants to go in there.

Mr. Pollard stated that they are in discussion with the owner at this point to figure out a chain link scenario that will secure the facility.

Mr. Engle stated that not only are they going to take off all the original material, but they are going to put up chain link fencing around the entire building, too.

Mr. Gay asked if the chain link would be permanent.

Mr. Pollard answered no; it is just a temporary measure.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Daniel Carey of the History Savannah Foundation said that as they jump into the analysis of these buildings, they sometimes forget to acknowledge the good work that is proposed to be done on the buildings such as this, which is stabilization in some form or adaptive use. This is commendable and Historic Savannah appreciates it. However, in light of the comments he made at the last meeting about would he consider this to be uncertain ground that they are on - sort of serving two masters. Maybe applying the standards, maybe not applying the standards; getting a determination of eligibility or not getting a determination of eligibility. He asked if they are talking about demolition when they replace approximately 50% or more of the materials; are they not talking about demolition. There are so many questions that it would seem to warrant this coming back, but only coming back after they get all those questions settled.

Mr. Carey said he believes that getting a determination of eligibility from the State's Preservation office would not be onerous. At this point, he believes they would be on firm footing and he believes also that the City Attorney would be pleased. He believes, too, that they should be able to apply the Secretary Standards to all parts of this building; whether it's the replacement of materials, the use of corrugated metal on the roof versus standing seam sheet metal. The time that it would take to answer all these questions, would save the petitioner a lot of time in the long run and give a little more clarity to this project because presently, he is still somewhat confused about what they are trying to achieve and what they will end up with. Mr. Carey said he would explore the City Attorney's office to have a presence at these meetings. It is clear that they need legal clarification from time-to-time and what they have are messengers and messages and these are not always clearly conveyed; not at the fault of the parties' involved, but they should have the proverbial horse's mouth here from time-to-time, especially on cases such as this.

Mr. Carey said his comments are of a general nature, but he believes that too many questions are here to be able to make a good decision today. He would consider asking the petitioner if he would consider coming back and at the same time have staff and anybody else that would need to be involved, get greater clarification on the determination of the building, the application of the standards, etc.

Mr. Gay asked that with a delay to wait until the State decides whether this building is a historic structure or not, would this result in the building possibly collapsing. The idea to him is to stabilize the building. They had another building on the other side of town where the wall collapsed while they waited. The same thing happened on Drayton Street. They called this demolition by neglect.

Mr. Carey stated that he does not believe that anyone is in favor of an unnecessary delay. He believes that the additional time will allow, at least in his mind, a lot of these questions to be answered. He believes that this would give the Board greater clarity in applying whatever standards they want to apply. Ultimately, it might benefit the petitioner because if it does become eligible and they want to use the rehabilitation tax credit, this could be of

some benefit to them. It could be an incentive.

Mr. Judson, too, stated that they are glad to see something happening here. It does bring up the question of demolition by neglect. This is certainly not what they want to have happen as a result of any decisions or undue delay in progress. At the last Board meeting, the entire question of whether or not it was appropriate to apply the Secretary of Interior Standards was raised and it was Mr. Carey's opinion, considered opinion of learned experts on this Board, that it should be of the initial response from the City that it was not historic, but he believes they see a strong case here where it could be historic.

Mr. Judson pointed out that what he was leading up to is the one thing that he knows is not in this Board's purview is to tell the petitioner that they do derail their process and go through the designation process. He told Mr. Carey that his points were well-taken and he could see where this would clarify things for everyone and make their decision-making process easier, but this is not the reality that they are dealing with today.

Mr. Carey stated that his comments are intended as much for the applicant as they are for Board.

Mr. Judson thanked Mr. Carey and said he appreciates his addressing the comments to him.

Ms. Ward clarified that with regard to the determination of eligibility, our ordinance does not recognize the State Historic Preservation Office or the National Register of Historic Places. The state could list this building, but it does not matter. It has to be whether it is classified on our Historic Building Map as adopted by City Council. The Preservation staff has found that it is eligible for listing on the map; however, the map has not been adopted. They will have to go through a public process which will include a public open house; recommendation by the MPC and then ultimately adoption by the Savannah City Council. This is what would be needed to list it. They do have before them the situation where they have consulted with the City Attorney's office and they have said basically all they would be doing is making a recommendation. The Board has to take the action that they feel is most defensible under the ordinance. They suggested that the standards can be applied if they feel that it is appropriate.

Mr. Judson explained that the Board's options include rendering a decision with respect to applying the Secretary of Interior Standards, but it is not within the Board's purview to designate that anything move forward with the determination or designation of the building in their own historic designation map.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Dr. Henry said it seems to him that the question of the skin of the building is the issue. He does not see what is the problem if they are going to store the windows, why not store the skin?

Mr. Judson stated that he believes a part of the issue is the actual existing skin as they have discussed is not reusable.

Mr. Gay stated that it is deteriorated.

Dr. Henry stated that he does not know if the Board agrees entirely with the statement of the deterioration.

Mr. Engle stated that he did not have a problem with the replacement of in-kind of the entire skin. This is consistent with the Secretary of Interior Standards. But, putting one-third of it back is not consistent with the Secretary of Interior Standards as it could sit there for 15 years, be vandalized and burnt down. The building should be secured. This is a part of stabilization and rehabilitation.

Ms. Simpson said they want to be sure that the entire building is stabilized air-tight. Her concern is the amount of time that someone could move into the building and it would just be sitting there and open.

Mr. Engle stated that the Secretary Standards has an entire section as well as our ordinance about what to do when they are mothballing a building. The Secretary Standards has an entire technical manual on how to mothball buildings. He sees that the Standards are applicable here.

Mr. Judson said he wanted to put out one question for consideration and he understood the petitioner's concern for future use of this building. But, his question is if they determine that the Secretary of Interior's Standards are applicable to this building, then the future use or advantageous of meeting a client would be a moot point because the building would need to be restored to the Secretary of Interior's Standards. Therefore, it will not be at the discretion of a future tenant to say they want different openings, apertures, etc.

Mr. Engle concurred with Mr. Judson's statement and said basically the windows would have to go back, but modifications could be made. Essentially, the integrity form would have to back.

Dr. Henry wanted to hear Mr. Pollard's response to this.

Mr. Pollard stated that to force a standard would be a hinderance to his client in the future. Ultimately, they are coming back for a second review anyway at the point of time they get a tenant or when a future use is proposed. Their aim now is to structurally stabilize the building, have it temporarily opened, but get it permanently secured while waiting for a new tenant to come into place. He is not looking for the new standard to be set by the Historic Review Board. As he has stated, they just want the building to be stabilized.

Dr. Henry said Mr. Pollard appears to have a different definition of stabilization than the Secretary of Interior.

Mr. Pollard said his stabilization is structural. If there was a hurricane force wind this summer, they would not be having this discussion as the building would be on the ground. This is what he is worried about. They have fall winds that could make this building fall. The building has been neglected long enough and with it coming into his company's purview, it is their opinion that it needs to be stabilized quickly. He said he means stabilized structurally, not stabilized in a historically perspective. Mr. Pollard said he is in agreement with the staff's recommendation. If the Board wishes to disagree with the

staff's recommendation, then this is not his to comment.

Ms. Ward clarified that if the Standards are applied, any replacement materials would need to be put back in-kind to match existing if they could not be repaired. This includes the corrugated metal, the bick, and the windows.

Upon motion of Mr. Engle, seconded by Ms. Ramsay and carried, the Historic Review Board unanimously determined that the Secretary of the Interior Standards apply to the proposed request because it is an outbuilding to a historic structure, the Kehoe Iron Works.

Mr. Tom Thomson, Executive Director - MPC, upon the Board's completion of voting that the Secretary of Interior's Standard apply to this building, stated that he believes the Board had a good discussion about what standards to apply and the building would have to be restored in-kind. He wanted to delve into the history of this Board as many members now were not on this Board when this occurred. He wanted to be frank about it. Mr. Carey said some astute things about notwithstanding that the owner intends to try to maintain the structural integrity of this building; through their suggestion there are issues that relate to historic value that need to be addressed. Mr. Thomson said he would like for the Board to think strategically about this. Now, that the standards are going to be applied which include covering the entire building, but he does not believe that anything from a reasonable point-of-view means that it cannot be done in two stages. The covering of the building and stabilizing it and then come back at a future date to finish whatever needs to be done.

Mr. Thomson said he wanted to offer an option to the Board - he does so because there has been decisions made by this Board in the past that have resulted in unnecessary demolitions because a decision was made and it got put into somebody else's court to make a decision that caused buildings to be demolished when they were being proposed here to be restored. He cited the Drayton Street gas station as an example. This Board turned down, not great, but a pretty good design to maintain some of the old building as part of the project.

Mr. Gay injected that was their intent.

Mr. Thomson said whatever the intent was, the fact was the decision-making sequence on this caused the building to be demolished 30 seconds after City Council made a decision. He wanted the Board to think strategically about this. As the Executive Director and as he sits here and watch these meetings, it is important to maintain the history and maintain the integrity of the buildings, but it does not necessarily have to be done in one bite. They board up buildings all over this city which he believes is worse than to do a partial restoration. However, these are his comments as a citizen.

Mr. Gay stated that first of all, this Board has not been lead to believe that the owners have any intention of demolishing this building and they have not been directed by the City to do so. But, they had this with the other building. At that meeting, the Chairman told the Board that if they turned it down, the City had already told them that they have to demolish the building and the next morning it was demolished. The Chairman and he were the ones who voted to approve the plans fully knowing that it was not going to be exactly like that. But, as he has said, the owners of this building have not indicated that if the Board does not approve their request that they will demolish the building tomorrow. Therefore, he

believes that this situation is different from the case mentioned by the Executive Director.

Mr. Thomson explained that what the Board heard was the frustration of City Council about the entire episode. The City Council said if the Board could not come up with a design that they could approve, that City Council's job is not to approve the building design as it is the job of the Historic Review Board.

Mr. Gay stated that the Board was warned that if it was turned down this is what was going to happen.

Mr. Thomson said the building was not in imminent danger of falling down.

Mr. Gay said, however, it was gone the next day!

Mr. Engle explained that the petitioner would only need to come back with a set of plans for stabilization that are consistently with the Secretary of Interior's Standard. Nothing has to be done twice.

Mr. Thomson said he was only suggestion that whatever they do to the extent that they do it, that it is done according to standards based upon the vote the Board just took.

Ms. Ramsay said that if there will be a Phase I and II, could the Board stipulate a time when Phase II would need to be implemented.

Ms. Ward stated that she just consulted with Mike Rose, Building Inspector for the City of Savannah, as to whether or not the petitioner would get a Certificate of Occupancy if they only did the stabilization which means that they would have a tenant and want to use the building. She reported that Mr. Rose advised her that for stabilization the petitioner would get a Certificate of Completion, but that the building may not be fully occupied. She believes that if the Board allows the petitioner to phase it, it needs to be worded carefully in their motion. She stated that the Board could vote to go ahead and require whatever they see fit for the full length of the project, but may be the petitioner could only complete it to a certain phase right now.

Ms. Ramsay stated may be Ms. Ward is saying give the petitioner a date certain.

Mr. Judson stated that the Board's approvals have a two-year expiration. He did not know if this is applicable here.

Ms. Ward explained that the Board's approval is to allow the petitioner to get the permit; therefore, once they get the permit, they have a valid permit to do the work. In the past, they have never said the project has to be completed by a certain date as anything could happen.

Mr. Pollard stated that a Certificate of Occupancy would not be allowed in accordance with the building officials. They would need to come back with an improved use through zoning, etc. and provide them with documentation in drawing format. Just as Ms. Ward has stated, they will only get a Certificate of Completion; no occupancy allowed.

Dr. Henry asked if it was being said that the vote they just took put the building possibly in a situation of being demolished.

Mr. Thomson explained that he was saying that if the requirement is for the applicant to totally restore the building, which he understood to be the criteria to say that the building would need to be replaced in-kind. This means that you may take off and do whatever you will do to maintain the building, but all of it would need to be replaced. Therefore, it would be like this, but newer. What he was saying is that he believes the Board is moving significantly forward if they allow the petitioner to do it in affordable steps versus letting a wind storm knock it down if it is that potentially unstable. He was not suggesting that the petitioner come back and ask that it be demolished, but that as time goes by, it may increase the risk of the building falling by itself.

Mr. Judson said the demolition of the building would require a separate petition.

Ms. Simpson said if the petitioner waits 15 years to completely rehabilitate the building time is still going by. Things happen to buildings that are not completely stabilized or mothballed.

Mr. Engle said that no one is saying that the petitioner has to put it all back. This Board has not discussed that all the windows be put back now. They have only said that the windows be recorded and stored. The standards are flexible. This Board does not have a plan from the petitioner that is designed to deal with the Secretary of Interior's Standards. The petitioner has said that he is only interested in structural standards. What this Board needs to make its decision is a plan that applies to the Secretary of Interior's Standards to what this petitioner wants to do. If they don't want to put all the windows back, then their plan should propose this. Then the Board could make an assessment based on the standards. He said the Board is being asked to make an assessment of a plan that did not even recognize the standards. This is his problem. There are standards for stabilization, but as he has said they are not dealt with here. He suggested that the petitioner should revise their plan and then come back with what they want to do according to the Secretary of Interior's Standards. Then the Board could review this.

Mr. Pollard said they, as a firm, have set up a plan to document the windows, remove the windows, and store the windows on site. The windows will be there to use in the future; they are not there to be discarded, or anything of this manner. The staff's recommendation on previous buildings that he has worked on, has been to remove windows and restore them within the facility that they are a part of, which is for future reuse. He did not see where this is against the standards. It is just phase I of a two phase process which is he is stabilizing the structure physically in this regard and then they will come back and apply the standards. He is putting on a roof that does not appear to be in question; he is putting on siding that is not in question at this point. He is doing half of it - Phase I of Phase II.

Mr. Engle stated, however, the building will be left opened which is not consistent with the Standards and there are ways to close the building in without having to restore it at this point. If the petitioner does this, then they would not have to put up a cyclone fence.

Mr. Pollard asked for a suggestion besides putting up the extra siding. He said he is open to suggestions.

Mr. Engle said the staff could give Mr. Pollard a copy of the Secretary of Interior's Standards.

Mr. Judson explained that a motion could stipulate that the petitioner review the procedures with staff and if for any reasons they are not amenable or the staff does not feel something is being met, then it could come back before the Board. But, he does not believe that the Board needs to have the petitioner come back in 30 days to review what has been learned about the mothballing procedure, if everything else that the petitioner is proposing to do in their judgment is compliant with the standards.

Ms. Ward stated that she needs more direction from the Board. The ordinance recommends that they use the Secretary of Interior's Standards for rehabilitation. She does not know exactly what the Board is looking for in terms of what they want to see as an alternate material on the exterior if it is not to go back to match what was there. She is unsure of what would be appropriate or what the Board would find appropriate.

Mr. Gay said he believes that what is Mr. Engle's problem is that some of the materials are not being put back presently.

Mr. Engle stated that he believes the building needs to be closed-in not only from the element, but from vandalism and everything else.

Mr. Judson explained that he believes that Ms. Ward's specific question is do they have the resources to provide the Secretary of Interior's Standards to the applicant.

Mr. Engle stated that he was not saying that the petitioner needs to restore the exterior now, but he is saying that the petitioner has to mothball it.

Dr. Henry stated that perhaps an ancillary motion is needed to meet the question to the effect that as long as the building is sealed in, the Board is okay.

Mr. Judson stated he believes at this point a motion is needed to cover the Board's concerns. He believes, further, that it would be within the staff's purview to review those standards as long as the Board stipulates that it is the Board's decision that the building not be left open; that it be enclosed in accordance with the mothballing standards of the Secretary of Interior.

Board Action:

Approval for stabilization of the Kehoe Machine Shop building provided that the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Stabilization be met and the plans be reviewed by staff for final approval.

As indicated on the revised submittal, windows must be retained in situ or stored on-site until - PASS

repairs are made and reinstalled. Documentation of their location to be undertaken with measured drawings must be resubmitted to staff prior to issuance of a building permit and windows should be reinstalled after stabilization is complete.

Vote Results

Motion: Nicholas Henry
Second: Sidney J. Johnson
Reed Engle
Ned Gay
Nicholas Henry
Gene Hutchinson
Sidney J. Johnson
Brian Judson
W James Overton
Linda Ramsay
Ebony Simpson

- Aye
- Aye
- Aye
- Not Present
- Aye
- Abstain
- Not Present
- Aye
- Aye

11. [Petition of William Bridges for Gateway Restoration - H-10-4311-2 - 521 East Gaston Street - Rehabilitation and Exterior Alterations](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Mr. William Bridges was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Sarah Ward gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for rehabilitation and exterior alterations to the building at 521 East Gaston Street. This request was approved by the Board on August 13, 2008, but the property owner did not move forward with the repairs at that time. Therefore, this is exactly the same application and contractor. Since this was two years ago, a new application had to be made.

Ms. Ward reported that the staff recommends approval for the rehabilitation and exterior alterations as submitted.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Bridges stated that he did not have anything to add to the staff's report. The property owner has said that he will do the work this time. He believes that the City has been talking with the owner about the property.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Daniel Carey of Historic Savannah Foundation (HSF) stated that he had two comments. In an effort to rehabilitate the wood porch elements, he wonders if they sometimes need to keep in mind the porch itself; that's concrete, that used to be wood. They are not suggesting necessarily that they go to the great extent of removing the

concrete porch and replace it with wood. However, they do have these questions when they talk about what elements need to be retained from previous periods. The wrought iron and railings could be from the 1960s and they are starting to approach an age of eligibility; not unlike the windows on Oglethorpe Avenue that they allowed to show the evolution of the buildings. Mr. Carey said retaining a part of the wooden porch elements is good, but where does this stop and how far should they ask an applicant to go especially with the concrete portion? He said they, as the architectural review committee, want as much restraint as possible on the columns because without real evidence and a nice sampling of photographs, there is still a lot of speculation as to what they might look like and how much detail was there. Should there be bracket, chamfered or simple rectilinear form, etc. The drawings and the notes were well intended, but may be a little inadequate. This made it a little hard for HSF and he was sure challenging for staff as well. These are the points that they are trying to convey.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Ramsay stated that she was a little concerned about facing the concrete with brick and how is the detailing when it is finished off at the top. Will there just be brick on the outside and the concrete will be on the inside?

Mr. Bridges said it is cinder block now. He will use a three-quarter (3/4) brickface to match any similar brick colors as possible that are next door. They would end with a wooden fascia board covering it. They will go all the way up to the cinderblock and then there will be a seven and one-half inch fascia board (7 1/2) that will serve as the top riser on the stairs.

Ms. Ramsay said that she is comfortable with the petitioner working this out with staff.

Mr. Gay said because the drawings are not drawn to architectural standards, it is a little difficult because of all the pictures taken, he asked what are they looking at. He assumed they were looking at the upper middle picture shown on the monitor.

Mr. Bridges pointing to a house on the monitor and stated that it is exactly the same as theirs, except it is the reverse in layout.

Mr. Engle stated that in reference to what Ms. Ramsay said, if they look at photo 3, the riser are on unequal height now. The top riser appears to be approximately two inches shorter than the riser below. This suggests that the concrete slab was put in later than the steps. When the wood was here, it was a couple inches higher.

Mr. Bridges stated that possibly the slab will be removed. The stairs are coming out because as they can see the rung is off.

Mr. Engle clarified/stated that the little step is what the Historic Savannah Foundation was talking about. It would be easier to put the porch back in or actually just put a sleeper down on top of the slab and put in a wood floor. This would bring the riser height up to the correct level.

Mr. Bridges said this would be a good option as long as he has enough room at the door.

Mr. Engle said it appears that there are three to four inches at the door.

Mr. Bridges said he was considering putting in a sleeper and that he would have to get underneath to see what the slab is like.

Mr. Engle stated that is structure, the petitioner could put sleepers and wood and restore the porch. This would make a difference because if they are being consistent, the iron would end where the concrete ends.

Mr. Gay asked if this means the brick work would not be done.

Mr. Engle said if a wood floor is installed, then the brick could be recessed behind the fascia. He asked Mr. Bridges if he believes that the owner would be willing to go along with this.

Mr. Bridges answered yes.

Board Action:

Approve the rehabilitation and exterior alterations with the condition that a wood porch floor and fascia be installed. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: Nicholas Henry

Reed Engle	- Aye
Ned Gay	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Gene Hutchinson	- Not Present
Sidney J. Johnson	- Aye
Brian Judson	- Abstain
W James Overton	- Not Present
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye

12. [Petition of Ann Stephens for Cowart Coleman Group - H-10-4319-2 - 518 East Bryan Street - Addition](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Mr. Jerry Cowart was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Sarah Ward gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for a garage

addition to the rear of the building at 518 East Bryan Street. The addition is a one-story, two-car garage that extends to the lane.

Ms. Ward reported that the staff recommends approval of the garage addition with the condition that the parapet height be reduced and resubmitted to staff for final approval.

Mr. Gay asked Ms. Ward what is the purpose of an air-condition being here; this is a garage.

Ms. Ward said the petitioner would be able to answer this question.

Mr. Gay said usually, you don't see parapet walls on carriage houses.

Ms. Ward said that a lot of times you will have a slight parapet. There will be low slooping shed roof to drain the water. In this case instead of having a scupper where the water drains out into the lane, they will have cricket. So the scuppers on the side of the building will drain off the side of the property. If the petitioner had a shed roof, they would want a small parapet to be here to cover the shed roof. They could have a pitched roof with an overhang if they wanted to do so.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Cowart said they received the staff's comments and they have made an effort to see how they can lower the parapet wall. He talked with the owner and he is comfortable with this. Presently, the wall is 15 feet high from the top of the slab; a nine foot high ceiling with an eight inch ceiling joist. Therefore, the distance from the top of the ceiling joist to the top of the parapet wall is five feet, four inches. They are offering a 13 foot height from the top of the slab to the top of the parapet wall. They have done this by lowering the slope of the roof and pushing the air conditioning unit away from the parapet wall.

Mr. Gay wanted to know what is the purpose of the air conditioning unit.

Mr. Cowart stated that it is the air conditioning compressor for the entire house. Where the garage is going, precludes leaving the air conditioner compressors where they are now. The elevation from the lane was 15 feet, but they are proposing 13 feet-eight inches and they agree that the proportions are better. There were some motivating factors that caused them to have the 15 foot parapet wall; one of which was an existing cornice that is on the rear addition. They were going to align with this, but found out that they don't need to do so as it looks better this way.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Daniel Carey of the SavannahHistoric Foundation stated that 13 feet-eight inches is greatly improved from 15 feet. He was wondering if the petitioner would be able to achieve the full two feet if not more. The question then would be how high is an HVAC unit? How can it be adequately hidden? If they look at the building, especially from the side view; he believes it is the west elevation you fully grasp the large solid, brick wall. While it is technically subserverent to the other parts, it is still pretty substantial. It seems unnecessarily high.

Mr. Gay said it looks as if another building is next to it as shown in the picture below. If another is next to it, it would sort of break up the solid brick.

Mr. Carey said if the units are not that large, may be this would bring the parapet down even further and he feels that this would be preferable.

Mr. Judson said in looking at the picture, it is 15 feet. Therefore, the 16 inches reduction that the petitioner has proposed would be approximately ten percent of that height being reduced. Mr. Judson asked Ms. Ward if she was aware that a building Mr. Gay called their attention to is in fact here.

Ms. Ward stated that Mr. Cowart could answer the question of the building next door. However, she believes there are photos of the site that they can go to that will illustrate what is here.

Mr. Judson in looking at the illustration stated that it shows that it is not out to the lane. It is recessed.

Mr. Engle asked aren't garden walls allowed to be 14 feet tall.

Ms. Ward answered 11 feet tall.

Ms. Simpson asked Ms. Ward what is her thought on the new proposal.

Ms. Ward answered that she believes it is better than what was proposed initially. However, she wished that the petitioner could go the full two feet. She said a four foot parapet is more typical in the district and even reducing it two feet would still be four and one-half feet. She was hoping that the petitioner could do this, but she believes that what was presented is an alternative or at least a bridge.

Dr. Henry asked Ms. Ward what is the problem of going that extra distance.

Mr. Cowart said they will agree to a two foot reduction. They will figure out a way to do it.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Mr. Engle wanted to remind the Board that McDonald's units are being hung behind a four foot parapet. Consequently, they do make units that will go behind a four foot parapet.

Board Action:

Approve the garage addition with the condition that the parapet height be reduced by two feet and - PASS
resubmitted to staff for final approval.

Vote Results

Motion: Linda Ramsay	
Second: Ebony Simpson	
Reed Engle	- Aye
Ned Gay	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Gene Hutchinson	- Not Present
Sidney J. Johnson	- Aye
Brian Judson	- Abstain
W James Overton	- Not Present
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye

13. [Petition of Timothy J. Bright for Holder Properties, Inc. - H-10-4323-2 - 22 Barnard Street - New Construction, Part I, Height and Mass](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Present for the petition were **Mr. John Holder of Holder Properties; Mr. Tim Bright, Petitioner; Mr. Christopher Cay, property owner; Mr. Huntly Gordon, contractor; Mr. Steve Szczecinski of New South Construction; Mr. Joe Stryker and Mr. Mark Valliere of Small, Reynolds, and Stewart Architects.**

Ms. Sarah Ward gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for New Construction, Part I Height and Mass, of a six-story mixed use commercial, retail-office building on the vacant north east Trust Lot on Ellis Square bound by Barnard, Bryan, Whitaker and St. Julian Streets. This site has been selected by the General Services Administration (GSA). There are no other bidders. They have made their final decision and have signed the lease agreement for this property. Comments are available from the Site Plan review. The comments do not impact the design. Ms. Ward said she was most interested in the comments from Traffic Engineering regarding the location of the trash compactors off of Whitaker Street. The report just says that they need to show how the trucks will maneuver in and out of the facility.

Ms. Ward reported that the staff recommends approval for Part I, Height and Mass, upon the reduction in height and noted design considerations, including further articulation of the brick parapet and the Whitaker Street entrance, to be submitted for Part II, Design Details.

Mr. Judson asked Ms. Ward if she has a specific proposal for the height reduction. He was not clear on the lot coverage. He wanted to know if the Board would have to recommend a finding-of-fact 106% for a zoning variance.

Ms. Ward answered no. The petitioners are allowed to cover 100% of their lot. The petitioner does not need to seek a variance. She said she was a little hesitant to put a number on the height here as she did with the parapet because it was a measurable thing; she is asking them to change four feet in parapet. However, she does not want to say this is the

magic number. Ms. Ward would like for the petitioner to address this in some way.

Dr. Henry asked Ms. Ward or Mr. Thomson to give some information on the urban legend regarding the GSA. He was told that GSA had an agreement with the City when they built the two tile structures. The buildings were not supposed to be tile, but at the last minute GSA changed and built the two tile buildings.

Ms. Ward explained that this project is a little different than the federal buildings. This building is owned by a private individual who will be leasing space to the GSA. Unlike the other buildings which were owned by the federal government who does not have to comply with the Historic Review Board. This is a private office building and they do have to meet the standards in the ordinance.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Valliere stated that they are excited about doing this project in Savannah. He spoke on the design. According to 106%, the parking structures underground are all in place. The columns are in 60 foot centerline to centerline. This of course composites a 60 foot trust lot property line. The columns are setting right in the center of the property line. When they come up with their columns, they will have to come off those and when they put their skin on it, this why it ends up over. They are trying to keep it as tight as possible as they are limited on sidewalk and they want to have a nice sidewalk.

There could be an issue with the height. But, hopefully there are ways that they can get around it. GSA attorneys require a nine foot ceiling height in their office space. The 13 feet-four inches floor to floor will accommodate a nine foot ceiling height, plus the structure and all the duct work. If they try to go tighter than this, probably will save about one-half inch or one inch if they are fortunate. He said that 13 feet-four inches is standard and tight. This is the typical floor-to-floor on levels two all the way to levels six. On the street level, which is the retail, they will go 15 feet-four inches. He said actually they have dropped this three feet from when this project started. They, too, were concerned about keeping the height of the building down. Mr. Valliere said that 15 feet-four inches will give them probably about an 11 feet ceiling height for the retail which is borderline. But, if they come down lower than this, it could be an issue with the developer and owner as to whether they would be comfortable coming down lower with the ground level floor and still be able to lease the space. He said regarding the relationship across St. Julian Street - what they have tried to do is the base of the building is two stories tall. Of course given the program of a six story office building, they could not necessarily bring down the entire building to match what is on the other side. Therefore, they have tried to use the base of the building to create the relationship to the property across the other trust lot. He believes this addresses the issues that were raised. Regarding the remaining issues that were pointed out, they are in agreement to try to make the changes and respond to them.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Daniel Carey of Historic Savannah Foundation stated that their Architecture Review Committee looked at this project closely. He extended an invitation to the petitioner to visit with them certainly in Part II. They did not have the opportunity in Part I, but when they get to Part II they would welcome their participation at one of their

meetings. He believes the petitioners would find it usual and constructive. Mr. Carey stated that he trusts that GSA is motivated to be in this space and maybe might find it within themselves to adjust their typical floor-to-floor standards for the opportunity of being in a National Historic Landmark District. This building is 200% taller than all the surroundings historic buildings on Ellis Square and, therefore, greatly impacts this square; as to whether it is believed that this is a positive or negative impact is at the discretion of each individual. This proposed building is substantially taller than any of the historic buildings and is even taller than the Avia building, which is a new building.

Mr. Carey said they strongly agree with staff in recommending the reduction of the overall height to be more compatible with the historic two and three story structures to which it is visually related, as well as the recommendation to examine additional measures to make it more compatible with the historic context. He guesses that he would propose that there are concentric circles of influences and the most immediate is the most important, historically speaking is the "Paula Deen" block and the other trust lot is the prevailing consideration; not the Avia or the other modern buildings around it nor the taller buildings, but the historic buildings as you go out into the concentric circles. There is an influence here, but it should be a decreasing influence.

Mr. Carey believes that Ms. Ward made a point about the varying height and roof line with the center. He wanted to offer that this is achieved as they are getting a variation in roof line, but in their opinion, the way to achieve this is not by going ten feet higher in the middle, but by coming down. There are two ways of achieving height and varying roof lines and they are suggesting that it come down, not go up. Again, whatever is decided today or it's continued for whatever reason, that the massing needs to be studied and carefully considered. There is a very strong vertical orientation of this building, at least in the fenestration pattern that makes a building especially on the east elevation and the west elevation as well to even appear to be higher than it may be. Mr. Carey believes that this sort of undermines the point of trying to keep it as low as you can. This is a 90 foot high building; it is a tall building; it is six stories and he understands what the ordinance allows, but it is too high and needs to be lower. Mr. Carey said he is hopeful that the tenant will be motivated to work within suggested guidelines and with staff's recommendation. He said the Historic Savannah Foundation makes itself available for further input and comment.

Mr. Carey apologized that he would be leaving the meeting as he has to go to a finance committee meeting. He reported that they are in agreement with the staff's recommendation of the remaining three cases.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Dr. Henry stated that he believes this is a nice design. He agrees with the staff's recommendation in that the building needs to be lower.

Mr. Engle said he looked at this very carefully. In comparison with a lot of the new buildings that this Board has seen, he believes this building is one of the best. He agrees that it is large, but unfortunately they have an ordinance that they all supported and it allows this. If it was reduced at the graciousness of the builders would be great, but it does meet all the criteria. Since they are not talking details now and only shrink wrap blob, he is concerned with the center section and what would be the cornice line. When they look at

the model, it shows a projecting cornice, but you don't read it at all. If they approve it as is and when it is shrink wrapped that's the way it is. Therefore, he believes that it needs something to articulate the center section. It looks like the penthouse is flopped on top of a flat surface. However, maybe it is supposed to look like a parapet wall, but it does not read that way.

Mr. Judson stated that if he understood correctly, the cornice is actually between the fifth and sixth floors.

Mr. Engle stated that he was not speaking of the cornice that Mr. Judson is talking about, but the other. It appears that there is a two or three feet ledge here, but you don't read that at all.

Mr. Valliere stated that it is small cornice. But there is no parapet.

Mr. Engle stated, therefore, there is no articulation. An articulation should be here.

Mr. Gay said the bricks stop.

Mr. Engle said if they look at Paula Deen's building, there is always articulation at the top of a parapet. He believes it falls flat. There is a substantial cornice further down, but you have cornices on both sides, but you have just short surface. Therefore, he believes it will read as flat surface which there will be no shadow line. It needs something to pick this out.

Mr. Gay stated that he did not believe there is a parapet in the mid section. He believes the parapet is on the two sides.

Mr. Valliere said the emphasis is going to the corners of the building. They are trying to deemphasize the middle. They will be coping on top of the wall, but they were not planning to do a cornice. The surface which really is the screen wall for the elevator machine rooms and the mechanical space that will be located up there and screening equipment that will be here that the tenant will put on the roof. They are trying to set it back as far as they can from the brick wall. This goes with trying to reduce the mid section as reviewed from the street.

Mr. Gay said the picture shows it being flush with the wall below it.

Mr. Valliere said that is close because this is where their elevator core is, which is at the exterior wall. They are coming in about six to eight inches from the brick face. The drawings look like it is flush, but it is actually offset. They are trying to offset it even further, if they can. They really don't want to emphasize the middle, but the corners. The middle, unfortunately, has to rise higher because this is naturally where the core has to be. They are open to perhaps bringing in the cornice and maybe wrapping it at the top.

Mr. Engle stated that in looking at photo 19, it does not read as a flat surface. Basically, it is the same situation here, except the pilasters continue all the way up to a coping.

Mr. Valliere said they would have to have the coping on the top.

Mr. Engle said it is a projecting coping.

Mr. Valliere stated that it is not a cornice, but a coping.

Mr. Engle stated that he was not saying a cornice, but he was saying have some sort of relief at the top so that there is a shadow line cast. It is just reading flat. He is not telling him what the details should be, but if they object now, when they do come back with the details the Board cannot say they want this. All he is saying is he believes the Board needs to be given details.

Ms. Ramsay said she agrees with the staff. When you sit in Ellis Square, it would overwhelm you. Most people will see the building from Ellis Square, not coming from Whitaker Street. In comparing this building to the others around Ellis Square, it is quite tall.

Mr. Judson stated that he disagrees largely because what the Board is being shown is far more aesthetically interesting and has more historical reference in its character and design. He would like for it to be taller than the Avia building because he believes it would read as a centerpiece and something more prominent than a less interesting modern building to the north of it. This is his personal opinion and he does not have a problem with the height.

Mr. Engle said he agrees and believes it is needed to finish off Ellis Square. His personal feeling is that Ellis Square looks like it is not complete. This is downtown and what makes Ellis Square great is that it is sort of green in the middle of a commercial area. He believes that if this building was the same height as the Avia building would be boring.

Mr. Gay stated that the details will make this an attractive building.

Mr. Engle said they could pick up some points from the Chatham National Bank. It would be nice to see it three or four feet shorter, but you cannot ask them to go to five floors when they have a right to go to six. He believes this is so much better than a lot of things that have been done. They need to be congratulated for a real good job.

Mr. Judson stated that he still contends that it looks and reads stronger being taller than the Avia.

Board Action:

Approve the petition for Part I, Height and Mass, upon the attempt to reduce the height and noted design considerations, including further articulation of the brick parapet on all four elevations to be submitted for Part II, Design Details. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Reed Engle	
Second: Ned Gay	
Reed Engle	- Aye
Ned Gay	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Gene Hutchinson	- Not Present
Sidney J. Johnson	- Aye
Brian Judson	- Abstain
W James Overton	- Not Present
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye

14. [Petition of Jonathan Darling - H-10-4324-2 - 306 West Upper Factor's Walk - Sign and Ancillary Structure](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Mr. Jonathan Darling was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Sarah Ward gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for a principal use facia sign and after-the-fact approval for new construction of an ancilliary shed structure at 306 West Upper Factor's Walk.

Ms. Ward reported that the staff recommends denial of the principal use sign because it does not meet the standards in the River Street-Factor's Walk sign district ordinance (Section 8-3120); denial of the ancillary structure because it does not meet the Visual Compatibility Factors or Design Standards in the Historic District ordinance (8-3030). The structure should be removed within 15 days.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Darling stated that he was not sure whether the staff got his e-mail, but they are going to pull back the shed. They are seeking assistance to get their sign installed. He asked the Board for suggestions as they want to open their business.

Mr. Judson asked, for clarification, Mr. Darling if he was saying that they were eliminating the shed structure.

Mr. Darling said yes, they are eliminating the shed.

Mr. Judson explained that he believes the staff's recommendation regarding the sign is clear. The sign needs to come in under ten feet.

Mr. Gay stated that the sign cannot be in front of the door.

Mr. Darling said he understood that the sign has to be within ten square feet. He wanted

to know if there is a certain area on the building where they need to put the sign.

Ms. Ward recommended to the Board that if the petitioner is willing to remove the shed structure and redesign the sign to be within ten square feet and not obscure any openings or historic features of the building, that they allow the petitioner to work with staff to approve their sign that meets the ordinance.

Mr. Judson asked if a motion would be for approval or for it to be removed to the Approved Staff section on the agenda.

Mr. Gay said the petitioner has already agreed that he will demolish the shed structure. The Board would only be approving for the staff to work with the petitioner on the sign.

Mr. Judson stated that he believes the Board is trying to respect the timeline. If the Board denies the petition, the petitioner would have to resubmit for a sign. He believes the appropriate motion would acknowledge the petitioner's willingness to take the shed down and approve the sign pending staff's review that it meets the sign ordinance as disclosed.

Mr. Engle said the petitioner stated that the shed would be eliminated, but he wanted to know the situation regarding the picnic tables and chairs. Does the petitioner have a cafe permit?

Ms. Ward stated that this is not their purview. The petitioner has submitted an application for a cafe permit. They must get their business license in order to get approval on their application for the cafe permit. They are undergoing this process presently. She said unless the petitioner withdraws his request for the structure, she believes the Board should take action on it.

Mr. Darling said he is withdrawing the request for the structure; they just want the sign.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

Board Action:

Approve a principal use sign to be resubmitted to staff for final approval for compliance with the River Street-Factors Walk sign district ordinance (Section 8-3120). The request for the ancilliary structure was withdrawn and the structure should be removed within 15 days of this decision. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Reed Engle	
Second: Ned Gay	
Reed Engle	- Aye
Ned Gay	- Aye
Nicholas Henry	- Aye
Gene Hutchinson	- Not Present
Sidney J. Johnson	- Aye
Brian Judson	- Abstain
W James Overton	- Not Present
Linda Ramsay	- Aye
Ebony Simpson	- Aye

15. [Petition of Ameir Mustafa for Signs for Minds - H-10-4325-2 - 111 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd. - Principal Use Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Mr. Ameir Mustafa was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Sarah Ward gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval for a principle use facia sign at 111 Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd. for the business Utrecht Art Supplies.

Ms. Ward reported that the staff recommends approval for the principal use facia sign with the condition that it fits within the architectural sign banner and not extend over the vertically oriented brick surround of the banner.

Mr. Engle asked Ms. Ward if she was speaking of the red palette or the letters.

Ms. Ward stated she was speaking of both. The red palette and the letters are considered as part of the signage. They should not bleed into the vertical brick course.

Mr. Engle said if the petitioner was willing to just move the palette into the center window, they could take "art supplies" in the band itself and keep the red palette the same size.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Mustafa said he was ready for any suggestions from the Board. He believes, however, that they did reduce the size of the logo where it says "Utrecht" (in red) it has been sized down.

Mr. Judson asked him if it was reduced from this drawing or to this drawing.

Mr. Mustafa answered to this drawing. Otherwise, the sign is in compliance with the City's ordinance. If they move the logo to the left or have the "Utrecht Art Supplies" to the right, they can do this if it is suggested. This was their original thought, but they were told that if they brought it closer to each other would be better.

Mr. Gay asked Mr. Mustafa why he did not put the logo in the glass structure over the doors.

Mr. Mustafa said if they put it here, it would be very hard to be seen from this location.

Ms. Simpson asked him that even with the separation of the two as shown on page 3, the written words are not in the band.

Ms. Ward explained that page three is only showing the gooseneck lighting, not the signage.

Mr. Engle said he has a problem with the red palette.

Mr. Gay wanted to know if the logo could be centered a little more. It appears to be closer to the upper portions of the bricks.

Mr. Mustafa stated that it is an outer band. They can remove it because from the top of the white part where the stucco will be is one line; then there is the top of the band itself. All of this raised about one inch off the brick. Therefore, it is not set directly on the brick.

Ms. Simpson said the sign would still not be within the architectural features of the building.

Mr. Mustafa said when they did what is shown now, they were looking at 31 inches. Anything smaller than this, the lettering would be smaller. This would defeat the purpose of having a logo.

Mr. Engle said it is only six bricks which is about 15 inches.

Dr. Henry asked Ms. Ward if Mr. Mustafa was saying that he is within the law pertaining to the size of the sign.

Ms. Ward answered that the sign is within the ordinance.

Dr. Henry asked Ms. Ward what is the Board's legal standard in saying that the sign as to be put inside the band.

Ms. Ward answered that the sign has to be in a signable area. She believes the signable area is confined to the sign band. Ms. Ward stated that if the logo is the more important feature of the sign that the petitioner wants to retain, he is only allowed one sign, he could do a projecting logo sign which could be larger than what he is proposing. Then he would be able to put the text on awnings that come off from the building.

Mr. Judson said if the petitioner rotated it and made the palette a blade, it would obscure the band its width, then he could still have the lettering where it is, but have a more striking sign. It would be more expensive for Mr. Mustafa's client to manufacture, but he believes this would satisfy the Board that it is not actually obscuring the band of bricks above and below. Mr. Mustafa is concerned about it being visible, he would not be reducing the size and it could be read from either direction.

Mr. Mustafa asked if he would be looking at two signs. He does not understand the blade aspect.

Ms. Ward said the petitioner cannot keep the lettering as is if he goes to a projecting sign. He can only have one or the other. What she was suggesting is that the petitioner can have an awning sign in addition to his projecting sign. If they really wanted to keep the text, they could put it on the awning so that it could be seen on the front in addition to the projecting sign. The petitioner can also do window graphics (she has ready talked with him about this) without a permit or approval.

Mr. Mustafa said that when he first looked at this job, he believed that the top line would be the outside border. The logo was bigger, but Ms. Ward suggested that he make the logo smaller and he told her that was not a problem. He said the sign is in compliance with the City ordinance. However, if the Board has anymore suggestions, he will talk with his client about it.

Mr. Judson informed Mr. Mustafa that the sign is not compliant because his understanding of the sign band is incorrect. The sign band is only the center section within the uniform raised brick. The articulation above it and below it is not a part of the sign band. Therefore, as shown in the picture even if the square footage is within the ordinance, the fact that the red palette extends over the upper and lower brick portion makes it out of compliance. This is the Board's concern. Mr. Judson asked him if he believes that his client would be amenable to a blade sign and move the lettering down as suggested by Ms. Ward to either an awning facia or mount on the windows.

Mr. Mustafa said he has talked with his client about the windows, but they told him that they do not want anything on the windows. They have interior advertising that goes inside of that and they do not want that to be in the way. They might be able to make the sign a little smaller almost touching the border line.

Mr. Judson said almost touching would be in compliance, but overlapping is not.

Dr. Henry asked the petitioner if he felt he needs a continuance in order to talk with his client about this matter.

Mr. Mustafa stated if it could be a continuance where he would still be able to work with the staff, then he would say yes.

Mr. Judson explained that with a continuance the applicant would have to come back. He explained that the Board could approve the petition with the stipulation that he return to staff and that the alternate resolution not obscure the brick coursing.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

Board Action:

Approve the principal use fascia sign with the condition that it fits within the architectural sign banner and not extend over the vertically oriented brick surround of the banner. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Ned Gay

Second: Nicholas Henry

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Gene Hutchinson - Not Present

Sidney J. Johnson - Aye

Brian Judson - Abstain

W James Overton - Not Present

Linda Ramsay - Aye

Ebony Simpson - Aye

16. [Petition of Paul Childers - H-10-4326-2 - 102 West Bryan Street - Sign](#)

Attachment: [Staff Report.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet.pdf](#)

Mr. Paul Childers was present on behalf of the petition.

Ms. Sarah Ward gave the staff report. The petitioner is requesting approval of a double-sided projecting disk illuminated principal use sign on 102 West Bryan Street.

Ms. Ward reported that the staff recommends approval for the internally illuminated principal use disk sign with the condition that the bracket be a flush mount bracket similar to other disk signs found in the Historic District.

PETITIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Childers stated that the reason they put the brackets on the corner was at the suggestion of the engineer. He said they would be coming to a corner and the other posts are on flat buildings. Therefore, they would almost have to shave the brick to go in. They have to do an angle line of some kind. The engineer was concerned with the wind and the affect on the corner.

Mr. Judson reminded the Board on the Leoci situation where they stipulated a specific relocation for a sign. It was mounted on the edge of the building, but it could not be engineered. Therefore, the Board needs to consider the practicality.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Ms. Simpson stated that they have had numerous applications that have come before them that have corner signs and it was figured out how they should be mounted.

Ms. Ward stated that they have a number of corner signs in the district. She could not recall a disk corner sign. They will have to meet the wind loads and all of the existing ones do meet the wind loads. This is a part of the permit process.

Mr. Judson asked if the part of the bracket that affixes to the building is an angle bracket.

Ms. Ward stated that her main concern is not the plate that touches the building, but it is the bar that projects from it. She did not understand why they could not have the bar that projects and touches the disk at the center as opposed to the top where it would look like a hanging sign.

Mr. Childers stated that he is amenable to working this out with the staff.

Board Action:

Approve the internally illuminated principal use disk sign with the condition that the bracket be restudied and resubmitted to staff for final approval. - PASS

Vote Results

Motion: Reed Engle

Second: Ebony Simpson

Reed Engle - Aye

Ned Gay - Aye

Nicholas Henry - Aye

Gene Hutchinson - Not Present

Sidney J. Johnson - Aye

Brian Judson - Abstain

W James Overton - Not Present

Linda Ramsay - Aye

Ebony Simpson - Aye

VIII. REQUEST FOR EXTENSIONS

IX. APPROVED STAFF REVIEWS

17. [Petition of Ray Pritchett - H-10-4298\(S\)-2 - 502 East Jones Street - Existing Windows and Doors](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4298\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4298\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No Action Required. Staff Approved.

18. [Petition of Sherwin Williams - CBD H-10-4300\(S\)-2 - 508 West Jones Street - Color Change](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 8-26 4300\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 8-26 4300\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No Action Required. Staff Approved.

19. [Petition of Jeff Whitlow for Whitlow Construction Co., Inc. - H-10-4301\(S\)-2 \(amended\) - 348 Lincoln Street - Stucco Repair/Repointing](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4301\(S\)-2 \(amended\).pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4301\(S\)-2 \(amended\).pdf](#)

No Action Required. Staff Approved.

20. [Petition of Coastal Canvas - H-10-4309\(S\)-2 - 32 Barnard Street - Color Change/Awning](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4309\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4309\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No Action Required. Staff Approved.

21. [Petition of Scott Thomas for CS Thomas Construction - H-10-4310\(S\)-2 - 318 W. Broughton Street - Color Change](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4310\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4310\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

22. [Petition of Coastal Canvas - H- 10- 4312\(S\) - 106 West Gwinnett St. - Awning](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4312\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4312\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No Action Required. Staff Approved.

23. [Petition of Mark J. Fitzpatrick for J. T. Construction Co., Inc. - H- 10 - 4313\(S\)-2 - 7 East Macon St. Garage Doors](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4313\(S\)-2.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4313\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No Action Required. Staff Approved.

24. [Petition of Maggie Granquist - H - 10-4314\(S\)-2 - 32 Barnard St. - Color Change](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4314\(S\)-2.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4314\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No Action Required. Staff Approved.

25. [Petition of Richard Reinhardt - H-10-4315\(S\)-2 - 326 W. Bay St. - Color Change](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4315\(S\)-2.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4315\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No Action Required. Staff Approved.

26. [Petition of Regina Cormier - H-10-4317\(S\)-2 - 223 W. River St. - Awning/Color Change](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4317\(S\)-2.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4317\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No Action Required. Staff Approved.

27. [Petition of Neil Dawson - H-10-4318\(S\)-2 - 15 Drayton Street - Stucco Repair/Repointing](#)

Attachment: [Staff Decision 4318\(S\)2.pdf](#)
Attachment: [Submittal Packet 4318\(S\)-2.pdf](#)

No Action Required. Staff Approved.

X. WORK PERFORMED WITHOUT A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

XI. NOTICES, PROCLAMATIONS, and ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Notices

28. [Historic Preservation Commission Training, November 5-6, 2010 in Carrollton, Georgia](#)

Attachment: [Historic Preservation Commission Training.pdf](#)

29. [Preserving Historic Windows Brochure](#)

Attachment: [Preserving Historic Windows Brochure.pdf](#)

XII. OTHER BUSINESS

New Business

30. [Nominating Committee](#)

Mr. Judson stated that the report from the Nominating Committee is due by December 2010. He appointed **Dr. Henry, Ms. Ramsay and Mr. Engle** to serve as the Nominating Committee to consider nominations for Chair and Vice-Chair for the year 2011.

He was aware that the staff sends the information by e-mail, but he asked the staff to please provide the Board with information on who needs to reapply for their positions.

Mr. Thomson said if the Board members whose terms are soon to expire, complete the application and submit it to the Clerk of Council along with a copy to their appropriate Alderman so they will know that they are still interested in serving on the Board.

Mr. Engle reported that the letter he received showed that his term expires December 2010.

Ms. Ward stated that the letter she received from the Clerk of Council shows that Mr. Engle's term expires 2011. She spoke with the Clerk this morning and there are three members whose term expires 2010. They are **Brian Judson, Linda Ramsay and Richard Law**.

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

31. [Next Meeting - Wednesday November 10, 2010 at 2:00 p.m. in the Arthur A. Mendonsa Hearing Room, MPC, 112 E. State Street](#)

There being no other business to come before the Historic Review Board, Mr. Judson adjourned the meeting at 5:40 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Sarah P. Ward
Preservation Director

SPW:mem

The Chatham County - Savannah Metropolitan Planning Commission provides meeting summary minutes which are adopted by the respective Board. Verbatim transcripts of minutes are the responsibility of the interested party.